

REMARKS

Examiner M. Masinick is thanked for the thorough examination and search of the subject Patent Application. Claims 21 and 27 have been amended. Claims 22 and 28 have been canceled.

All Claims are believed to be in condition for Allowance, and that is so requested.

Reconsideration of Claims 21-32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,263,255 to Tan et al is requested based on Amended Claims 21 and 27 and Canceled Claims 22 and 28 and on the following remarks.

Applicant agrees that Tan et al describes a process control system. However, Tan et al does not teach an important feature of Applicant's claimed invention as recited in Amended Claims 21 and 27. In particular, Claims 21 and 27 have been amended to include the limitation recited in Claims 22 and 28, respectively. For example, Claim 21 now reads:

21. (Currently Amended) A computer system for supervision and operation of a semiconductor facility, said system comprising:

a plurality of processing tools;

5 a manufacturing execution system to control said processing tools and to track manufacturing data;

a plurality of user set-up functions to selectively transfer user data from a plurality of users to said manufacturing execution system and to selectively transfer 10 said manufacturing data from said manufacturing execution system to said users; and

a user interface function to translate said manufacturing data prior to said transfer to said users and to translate said user data from said users prior to said 15 transfer to said manufacturing execution system wherein said user interface function is further capable of detecting faulty entries in said user data.

Amended Claim 21 now includes the limitation that the user interface function is capable of detecting faulty entries in the user data. This is a significant feature that is not found in the teachings of Tan et al. Tan et al teaches a "Fault Detection Monitoring" (Col. 6, line 63). However, the fault detection of

TS-00-096

Tan et al is directed to machine-generated faults. This is seen from the text of Tan et al in TABLE 1 as:

Fault Detection Monitoring . . . Provides factory operations and engineering personnel with a "window" into the current and past state of processing equipment, including processing activity, alarms, and faults (col. 6, lines 63-66)

By comparison, Applicant teaches:

- a user interface function, interpreting all data flowing between the user set-up mechanism of the computer operated method and a Manufacturing Execution System (MES) function of the OMI system, the user interface function including functions of formatting data, of detecting faulty entries, of screening for and highlighting entries according to data type or data source, of providing feedback to the human setup mechanism of the OMI system, of acting as a screening agent for data that are supplied by the MES function the OMI system (Specification, page 13, bold and underline added).

Applicant teaches detecting faulty user entries with the user interface function. Tan et al teach relaying machine generated faults to the user. These are two, distinctly different

TS-00-096
concepts. Therefore, Applicant's claimed invention, as recited in Claims 21 and 27, is not anticipated by Tan et al. The rejection of Claims 21 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should be removed on this basis. Further, Claims 22 and 28 have been canceled as now redundant. Finally, Claims 23-26 and 24-32 represent patentably distinct, further limitations on Claims 21 and 27 and should, therefore, not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Reconsideration of Claims 21-32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,263,255 to Tan et al is requested based on Amended Claims 21 and 27 and Canceled Claims 22 and 28 and on the above remarks.

Reconsideration of Claims 23 and 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,263,255 to Tan et al in view of U.S. Patent 5,423,716 to Strasbaugh is requested based on Amended Claims 21 and 27 and Canceled Claims 22 and 28 and on the following remarks.

As described above, Amended Claims 21 and 27 now contain the limitations of Claims 22 and 28, now canceled, that are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. In particular, neither Tan et al nor Strasbaugh teach nor suggest a user

TS-00-096
interface function that is capable of detecting faulty entries
in the user data. For this reason, the rejection under 35 U.S.C.
103(a) of Claims 23 and 29, dependent from Claims 22 and 28,
respectively, should be removed.

Reconsideration of Claims 23 and 29 rejected under 35
U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,263,255
to Tan et al in view of U.S. Patent 5,423,716 to Strasbaugh is
requested based on Amended Claims 21 and 27 and Canceled Claims
22 and 28 and on the above remarks.

Applicants have reviewed the prior art made of record and
not relied upon and have discussed their impact on the present
invention above.

Allowance of all Claims is requested.

It is requested that should Examiner M. Masinick not find
that the Claims are now Allowable that the Examiner call the
undersigned at 989-894-4392 to overcome any problems preventing
allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas R Schnabel

Douglas R. Schnabel, Reg. No. 47,927